



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/765,112	01/18/2001	Karl Lang	MTI1877-141	8261
8698	7590	09/28/2010		
STANDLEY LAW GROUP LLP			EXAMINER	
6300 Riverside Drive			WRIGHT, PATRICIA KATHRYN	
Dublin, OH 43017				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/28/2010 PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

---

*Ex parte* KARL LANG

---

Appeal 2009-011226  
Application 09/765,112  
Technology Center 1700

---

Before ADRIENE LEPIANE HANLON, DEMETRA J. MILLS, and  
KAREN M. HASTINGS, *Administrative Patent Judges*.

HANLON, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

DECISION ON APPEAL<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The two-month time period for filing an appeal or commencing a civil action, as recited in 37 C.F.R. § 1.304, or for filing a request for rehearing, as recited in 37 C.F.R. § 41.52, begins to run from the “MAIL DATE” (paper delivery mode) or the “NOTIFICATION DATE” (electronic delivery mode) shown on the PTOL-90A cover letter attached to this decision.

A. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This is an appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 from an Examiner's decision finally rejecting claims 2-29 and 35-38, all of the pending claims. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b).

We REVERSE.

The subject matter on appeal is directed to an analyzer system. Claim 35, reproduced below, is illustrative.

35. An analyzer system for immersing at least two instruments into a sample and removing the instruments therefrom, comprising:

a vertical guide;

an instrument holder constrained to move along the vertical guide to selectively immerse or remove the instruments, the instrument holder *comprising a holder device with at least two apertures, each aperture arranged to receive and hold one of the at least two instruments*;

a washing device with a central opening, positioned between the instrument holder and the sample such that the central opening and the holder element are maintained in co-axial relationship as the at least two instruments pass through the central opening, the washing device comprising a jet orifice and a supply conduit for a wash fluid, communicated to the jet orifice.

Appeal Brief dated November 17, 2008 ("Br."), Claims Appendix (emphasis added).

The only rejection before us on appeal is the rejection of claims 2-29 and 35-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of

Öhlin (US 3,552,212, issued January 5, 1971) and Harris (US 5,650,122, issued July 22, 1997).<sup>2</sup>

## B. DISCUSSION

There is no dispute that the holder device 22 of Öhlin has one aperture (for receiving and holding probe 18) rather than “at least two apertures” as recited in claim 35. *See* Ans. 4. The dispositive issue in this appeal is whether the claimed holder device comprising “at least two apertures” would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the teachings in Öhlin.<sup>3</sup> *See* Br. 12.

The Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to modify the holder device 22 of Öhlin to include at least two apertures as claimed “since the ordinary artisan would expect that this would increase instrument washing throughput.” Ans. 5. The Examiner also relies on *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669 (CCPA 1960), to establish that a holder device having “at least two apertures” as claimed would have been *per se* obvious. Ans. 5.

The apparatus disclosed in Öhlin is used to aspirate and dispense a quantity of a sample via a single probe 18, which is subsequently washed to prevent cross-contamination. *See, e.g.*, Öhlin 2:27-61. The Examiner does not explain why one of ordinary skill in the art would have used more than one probe 18 to perform the aspirating and dispensing function described in

---

<sup>2</sup> The Examiner withdrew the rejection of claims 2-29 and 35-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph in the Advisory Action dated October 27, 2008. The Examiner withdrew the rejection of claims 2-29, 35, 37, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ambers (US 4,338,280, issued July 6, 1982) in the Examiner’s Answer dated February 18, 2009 (“Ans.”), at 2.

<sup>3</sup> The Examiner does not rely on the teachings of Harris to cure this deficiency in Öhlin.

Öhlin. Thus, on this record, there is no reason why one of ordinary skill in the art would have modified the holder device 22 of Öhlin to include a second aperture for holding a second probe.

Moreover, the Court does not look favorably on *per se* rules of obviousness. See *In re Ochiai*, 71 F.3d 1565, 1570 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (no *per se* rule of obviousness exists). Therefore, we decline to adopt the Examiner's reasoning that the claimed holder device would have been *per se* obvious in view of the holding in *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669 (CCPA 1960).

In sum, the Examiner has failed to establish that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the holder device 22 of Öhlin to include a second aperture as recited in claim 35. Therefore, the § 103(a) rejection on appeal will be reversed.

D. DECISION

The decision of the Examiner is reversed.

REVERSED

kmm

STANDLEY LAW GROUP LLP  
6300 RIVERSIDE DRIVE  
DUBLIN, OH 43017